

**Draft Summary of the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group Meeting
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)
October 30, 2003**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted a meeting for the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group (RSWG) on October 30, 2003 in Oroville.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present a summary for interested parties who could not attend the meeting. The following are attachments to this summary:

Attachment 1	Meeting Agenda
Attachment 2	Meeting Attendees
Attachment 3	Flip Chart Notes
Attachment 4	Resource Action Identification Form – Trails
Attachment 5	Resource Actions – “A” List (revised 10/30/03)
Attachment 6	Resource Actions – “B” List (revised 10/30/03)
Attachment 7	Resource Actions – “Settlement” List (revised 10/30/03)
Attachment 8	Resource Actions – “Trails” List
Attachment 9	PowerPoint Presentation: R1
Attachment 10	PowerPoint Presentation: R6
Attachment 11	PowerPoint Presentation: R10

Introduction

Attendees were welcomed to the RSWG meeting. Attendees introduced themselves and their affiliations and the desired outcomes of the meeting were discussed. The meeting agenda and list of meeting attendees are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively. Meeting flip chart notes are included as Attachment 3.

Action Items – Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group Meetings

The Facilitator reviewed the status of action items from recent RSWG meetings:

Action Item #R86:	Check potential wildlife corridor issue from the California Department of Fish and Game.
Status:	Andy Atkinson (CDFG) has not been contacted or available to discuss this issue. It will be carried over to the next RSWG meeting.
Action Item #R89:	Identify which resource actions listed in the matrix will need Resource Action Identification Forms completed for them.
Status:	Previous versions of the Resource Action matrix and “cheat-sheets” use shading to denote which resource actions have forms completed for them. Only a few additional forms have subsequently been submitted, which will be noted in the matrix.

Trails Task Force Report

Pete Dangermond (JPA) reported on recent events at the JPA Trails Task Force meeting. The various trails-related resource actions were combined into one comprehensive resource action and a resource action identification form has been completed (see Attachment 4). This new trails resource action was checked against the old trails report prepared by the JPA and the “trails” resource action list to ensure consistency. There were three items that the Trails Task Force could

not reach consensus on, which are noted in the back of the form. The next step is for Pete Dangermond and Doug Rischbieter (DWR) to review the proposed resource action versus previous tallies performed by the RSWG.

One participant made a short presentation regarding the need to have separate trail systems for various user groups. She identified three constraints to the development of trails: land, environmental issues, and zoning/general plan conflicts. Based on the availability of land, she said there should be sufficient space for separate trail systems. Pete Dangermond identified the need for additional trails planning particularly on those issues that do not have consensus and suggested that this planning could occur through the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) general planning process. Some perspective on these issues may be provided by the Recreation Needs Analysis. It was noted that exact trail alignments are not needed at this time and that trail alignments should remain open to discussion.

The RSWG summarized those action items that are needed with respect to the trails planning effort. The RSWG was asked to review the proposed trails resource action and provide comments in writing. The RSWG acknowledged the need for additional planning for those items that do not have consensus. In addition, the JPA and DWR will coordinate on the A/B list sorting and priority tallies as they pertain to trails.

Review, Discuss, and Edit Draft RA Lists

Doug Rischbieter reminded the participants of the intent of the various resource action lists. The “A” list items are considered appropriate for environmental review. The “B” list items are not considered appropriate for detailed environmental review, and include all acquisition proposals. The “Settlement Issues” list includes those resource actions that DWR does not consider appropriate for environmental review at this time but could be introduced at the settlement table for negotiation. The PDEA Team will receive all of the lists, but only the “A” list will be initially analyzed. The “Trails Issues” list includes all of the proposed resource actions related to trails that were suggested to be generally incorporated into a single trails resource action for PDEA evaluation.

Revised resource action lists were distributed to the RSWG. The revised “A” list, “B” list, “Settlement” list, and “Trails” list are included as Attachments 5, 6, 7, and 8, respectively. It was noted that actions that are on the “A” list would not necessarily be implemented, but rather these items represent resource actions that warrant further analysis. The “A” list includes the comprehensive trails-related resource action. It was also noted that many of the resource actions selected for the propose recreation plan would not be implemented immediately but developed over the span of the license period (30-50 years). The “B” and “Settlement” lists would be treated the same, receiving limited analysis in the PDEA.

There were concerns by several RSWG members including Butte County that they did not have appropriate opportunities to comment on the lists to the same extent as the JPA. Doug Rischbieter pointed out that while all stakeholders had an opportunity to provide their input regarding priority actions, he suggested that any further comments on the lists should be submitted in writing to DWR for consideration to which DWR would respond in writing. He clarified that the “straw pole” tallies generated at previous RSWG meetings were used as only one of many tools to help DWR develop the various resource action lists.

One participant inquired where the socioeconomics-related resource actions were located. Dale Hoffman-Floerke (DWR) responded that they were inadvertently left off of the resource action lists but would be added to the settlement issue list because they are not considered needs-based. She added that all resource actions would be tracked with an explanation of how they were handled.

It was noted that many resource actions still do not have resource action identification forms completed. DWR and the PDEA Team will determine what additional information is necessary to evaluate these resource actions and may contact participants in the RSWG for information. The JPA and various stakeholders suggested all participants review the resource action matrix and provide completed forms for resource actions considered important to them. Representatives from the City of Oroville informed the RSWG that they intend to host a meeting on Friday, November 7 from 9AM – 1PM at the Veteran's Hall in Oroville to discuss the City and riverfront planning priorities.

The RSWG agreed to provide any comments to the lists to DWR by November 7. Comments will be re-distributed to the RSWG, considered by DWR and any changes to the lists will be distributed to the RSWG for review by November 14th. The resulting lists (A, B, and Settlement Issues) will be presented to the Plenary Group on November 18th and forwarded to the PDEA team to begin analysis. Any additional revisions to the lists will be reported through a conference call work group meeting on November 20th.

Discussion of Studies R1, R6, and R10

Final Interim Reports for R-1 (Vehicular Access Study), R-6 (ADA Accessibility Assessment), and R-10 (Recreation Facility Inventory and Condition Report) were distributed to the RSWG at the previous RSWG meeting. Iris Mayes (EDAW) presented a summary of these studies and pertinent results and responded to questions from the RSWG. Please refer to the PowerPoint presentations for R1, R6, and R10 for more details (see Attachment 9, 10, and 11, respectively).

Next Steps

The RSWG agreed to hold their November meeting as a conference call on the following date/time:

Date: Thursday, November 20, 2003

Time: 5pm – 6pm

Location: Sacramento / Oroville [via conference call]. Kevin Zeitler representing ORAC offered his Oroville office conference room for participants interested in meeting at one location to take part in the conference call. He will confirm the conference room availability and DWR will provide the address with the meeting notice to all RSWG participants.

Action Items

The following list of action items identified by the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group includes a description of the action, the participant responsible for the action, and item status.

Action Item #R86: Check potential wildlife corridor issue from the California Department of Fish and Game (*carry-over action item*).

Responsible: DWR

Due Date: November 20, 2003

Action Item #R90: Check on the status of socioeconomics-related action items and add to the "Settlement Issues" list.

Responsible: DWR

Due Date: November 20, 2003

Action Item #R91: Resolve outstanding trails-related issues. Review trails resource action and submit comments in writing for distribution to the Work Group by November

Work Group meeting. JPA and DWR will coordinate on priority tallies on trails items

Responsible: DWR / JPA / Work Group
Due Date: November 20, 2003

Action Item #R92: Send written comments to Doug Rischbieter (DWR) regarding content of lists and justification for why a resource action should be moved, and re-distribute lists to the RSWG.

Responsible: RSWG/DWR
Due Date: November 7/14, 2003

Action Item #R93: Review the resource action matrix and help fill out forms for “important” resource actions.

Responsible: RSWG
Due Date: November 20, 2003

Action Item #R94: Present resource action list to the Plenary Group and the PDEA team for analysis.

Responsible: DWR
Due Date: November 18, 2003

**Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group Meeting Agenda
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)
October 30, 2003**

Desired Outcomes

- *Update on Action Items*
- *Continue Discussion of Draft Resource Action (RA) Lists With the Goal to Forward Product(s) to PDEA Team and Plenary*
- *Identify Next Steps for the RSWG*

- I. Welcome and Introductions
- II. Action Items Review
- III. Trails Task Force Report
- IV. Review, Discuss, and Edit Draft RA Lists
- V. Discussion of Studies R1, R6, and R10
- VI. Next Steps

**Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group Meeting Attendees
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)**

Eva Begley	Department of Water Resources
Sonny Brandt	FRRPD / JPA
Pete Dangermond	Dangermond Associates / JPA
Ron Davis	California State Horseman Association
Chuck Everett	Harza/EDAW
Steve Feazel	Department of Parks and Recreation
Valerie Fischer-Gates	Resident
Cathy Hodges	Equestrian Trial Riders
Dale Hoffman-Floerke	Department of Water Resources
Lorraine Frazier	Local Citizen
Wade Hough	Butte Sailing Club
Mike Hurst	Lake Oroville Bicyclist Organization
Loren Gill	Berry Creek
John Colburn	State Water Contractors
DC Jones	Resident
G. Keefer	Resident
Patti Kroen	Facilitator
Scott Lawrence	Feather River Recreation and Parks District
Iris Mayes	Harza/EDAW
Mike Melanson	Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
Arlan Nickel	Department of Parks and Recreation
Steve Pavich	Harza/EDAW
Michael Pierce	Butte County
Doug Rischbieter	Department of Water Resources
Bob Sharkey	City of Oroville
Jim Upholt	Department of Water Resources
Jim Vogel	Harza/EDAW
Lyle Wright	Lake Oroville Bicyclist Organization
Kevin Zeiter	CFER / ORAC
Eric Zigas	ESA / City of Oroville

Notes from Flip Charts
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)

The following list was recorded on flip charts during the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group Meeting. The flip chart listing is not intended to be a transcript or analysis of the meeting or to indicate agreement or disagreement with the items listed; the intent is to provide a summary for informational purposes for interested parties who could not attend the meeting.

- Review trails RA and submit comments in writing for distribution to the Work Group by November WG
- Pete / Doug priority tally on trails RA
- Send written comments to Doug regarding content of lists and justification for why a RA should be moved. By November 7.

-
- A list = Analysis to be done by PDEA Team first (priority). Doesn't mean it will be implemented
 - B list = Redundancies, included in other work groups, acquisition, on-going management, not supported by DWR
 - Settlement = Likely to be brought to settlement negotiations.

(B list and Settlement list – similar treatment)

-
- Conf call: November 20, to review any additional RAs to PDEA Team
 - Comments to Doug by November 7; Re-distribute to WG – additional comments by November 14; Present to Plenary November 18

**Resource Action Identification Form – Trails
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)**

**Resource Actions – “A” List (revised 10/30/03)
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)**

**Resource Actions – “B” List (revised 10/30/03)
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)**

**Resource Actions – “Settlement” List (revised 10/30/03)
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)**

**Resource Actions – “Trails” List
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)**

**PowerPoint Presentation – R1
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)**

**PowerPoint Presentation – R6
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)**

**PowerPoint Presentation – R10
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)**